DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 552 **FL 010 359**

AUTHOR	Nold, Gunter
TITLE	Children's Use of a Second Language in the Classroom: A Contrastive Analysis of Discourse. Lektos: Interdisciplinary Working Papers in Language Sciences, Vol. 3, No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Louisville Univ., Ky. Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics.
PUB DATE	Nov 78
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Louisville, Interdisciplinary Program in Linguistics, Room 214 Humanities, Louisville, Kentucky 40208
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Language; *Comparative Analysis; Contrastive Linguistics; *Discourse Analysis; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); *German; Language Development; Language Research; *Linguistic Competence; *Sociolinguistics; Speech Communication; Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

Linguistic and pedagogical considerations about children's use of a second language in the classroom are discussed with reference to samples of speech obtained from ten to twelve year old children in Germany. The children had been taught the second language of English. The speech is examined in relation to functional and sociolinguistic criteria of discourse analysis. Speech is analyzed as a series of three transactions: the first two transactions are mixed informing and eliciting transactions, and the third is a directing transaction. Classroom discourse in which the students' speech behavior is tightly controlled by the teacher and free speech in the classroom are both analyzed. A German version of classroom discourse is contrasted with an English one. Language functions are viewed as integrated into a model of communicative competence. Two texts are discussed that are meant to show how children play the roles of adults. Pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic analyses of the English and German samples of free speech in the classroom give a clue to the behavioral strategies children use in order to participate successfully in second language discourse. Four strategies are discussed, and illustrations from texts are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

MISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
ERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John A. Robinson

HE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
RMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CHILDREN'S USE OF A SECOND LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE

Gunter Nold
Padagogische Hochschule Ludwigsburg
Frankfurt, am Main, West Germany

ED172552

1.1. In recent years the language used by teachers and pupils in the classroom has been a major field of linguistic studies. Both sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic research (cf. e.g. Houston 1972, Nold 1976, Rehbein 1975, Sinclair and Coulthard 1975) has contributed, on the one hand, to a deeper understanding of pedagogical issues, on the other hand, to a greater awareness of the factors involved in the acquisition and the use of language, and in consequence of this, to an elaboration of several systems of discourse analysis.

This paper actually combines aspects of both areas of research. Its special aim is the analysis of the use that children make of a second language that they have been learning in the classroom for a certain time. This topic involves both linguistic and pedagogical considerations.

It is essential to start with an empirical study of classroom discourse. The linguistic analysis of discourse is supposed to be the basis for certain observations in the field of the acquisition and use of language, in particular of a second language, and for pedagogical questions which result from the empirical study.

1.2. The experience gained from recordings of lessons held in different classes by different teachers over a period of three years served as a basis for a research strategy characterized by a prognostic and an evaluative approach (cf. Sankoff: 35,43). This approach made it necessary to collect systematically a corpus of speech to be examined in the light of functional and sociolinguistic criteria of discourse analysis.

The samples of speech that this paper is based on were taken from a limited number of children, mostly ten to twelve years old, in two state schools (Realschule) in Germany; the children had been taught the second language (English) for either five or seventeen months (100/300 lessons). A teacher gave two carefully planned lessons (each lesson partly in English, partly in German) in six classes that he had come to know beforehand. The same type of lesson was taught in three classes in order to get a sufficient number of comparable samples to choose from. This arrangement was supposed to facilitate the analysis as it restricts the number of variables involved. The lessons were recorded on tape and immediately afterwards commented on and a written version was worked out. A written account of relevant sections is given below; certain methods of discourse analysis are applied to them.

FL010359

The choice of samples does not represent a statistically evaluated cross-section of classroom discourse, but depends rather on qualitative criteria: the emphasis is on the factors and processes that can influence and determine speech behaviour in the classroom. This is to say, the samples of speech were selected so as to correlate empirical findings with certain questions, which at the outset can be put as follows: (1) What are the peculiar characteristics of the speech that the children who learn a second

language use in actual speech events in the classroom? (2) Furthermore, how do children use the second language compared to the use of their mother tongue in similar contexts?

2.1. Everybody familiar with teaching is certainly aware of the fact that speech in the classroom varies along with different methodological steps in a lesson. From a linguistic perspective Sinclair and Coulthard (Sinclair: 57) call the varying sections of speech in the classroom "transactions", pointing out that they can "...provisionally identify three major transaction types, informing, directing, and eliciting" (Sinclair: 56). These three types occur in second language teaching, too; however, the medium of discourse and the objectives of a lesson tend to coincide; consequently, the different types of transaction frequently merge.

The following example of classroom discourse demonstrates this among other things. The method of discourse analysis developed by Sinclair and Coulthard is applied to the speech that is used in a methodological step which introduces the class into a new context of the situation.

(TEXT 1)

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up	Act
Boundary	Now FRAME	m				
Direct	Look here (picture on board)	d	NV	rea		
Inform	We've got two mothers, Mrs Jones and Mrs Robinson. They can talk about a lot of things. -PAUSE- They are meeting in the street.	i				
Elicit	And you know what parents are like when they meet in the street. What can they talk about?	s el				
Re-Init	The two ladies The two mothers About their daughters of course. What can they say about their daughters? My daughter	cl cl s cl p	My daughter is very pretty.	rep	Yes of course	e
Re-Init			My daughter can read.	rep	Read	acc
Re-Init			My daughter has a nice dress.	rep	Mm	acc
Re-Init			My daughter has a dog.	rep	Mm	acc
Re-Init			My daughter can swimming.	rep		
Repeat	Can	el	swimming	rep	can swim	P-co
Re-Init			My daughter can swim.	re		
Elicit	Anything else?	el	My daughter can play football.	rep	That's right	e
Re-Init			My daughter can ride a bike.	rep	Mm	acc
Re-Init			My daughter has a car.	rep	NV (laughter) My daughter has got a car.	P-re acc

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act	Follow-up	Act
Elicit	Has she? She's seven years old. Well, what sort of car?	el s cl	NV (laughter) Kettcar!	rea rep		
Boundary	Now then FRAME Well, yes	m				
Elicit	I don't think -in the morning- what may she still be doing?	s el	She's asleep.	rep	She's asleep. Mm She may be.	acc com
Re-Init	What about her throat or her head. There's something wrong with her head.	el cl	She's ill in bed.	rep		
Re-Init	What may she have?	el	She has kopf-weh.	rep	a headache	e/
Repeat/ Inform	She's got a head-ache.	el /i	She's got a headache.	re	So she may be ill, she may still be in bed.	co
Boundary	All right FRAME	m				
Boundary	Now FRAME	m				
Direct	Let's have two mothers meeting in the street here in front of the class. Moni-ka and Annette would you come up to the front.	d n	NV	rea		
Boundary	All right FRAME	m				

Abbreviations: Re-Init - Re-Initiate Direct - Directive
s - starter el - elicitation d - directive i - informative
m - marker cl - clue p - prompt n - nomination
rea - react re - repeat rep - reply e - evaluation
acc - accept com - comment cor - correction P - pupil

For a complete list see Sinclair:4o-44.

In this section of classroom discourse one methodological step in a lesson is linguistically described as a series of three transactions. The first two transactions are mixed informing and eliciting transactions, the third is a directing transaction. Whereas the structure of the directing transaction conforms to the ideal type (Sinclair: 57), the structure of the first two only partly corresponds to it. A close examination of the two transactions can reveal their peculiar structure. At the beginning of the first transaction emphasis is put on an informing exchange from the teacher as in the case of an informing transaction. The elicitations that follow could superficially be regarded as part of the expected sequence of informing and checking the pupils' understanding, which is typical of an informing transaction. The elicitations certainly check the pupils' understanding and knowledge, although it is not so much their knowledge of the information just acquired--the two characters, Mrs. Jones and Mrs. Robinson--that is being checked as their general knowledge of the two types of character. However, the elicitations are also meant to check the pupils' ability to express their knowledge in the second language, this is to say, to make an adequate choice from the phonological, grammatical, and lexical system of the language. This is why corrections of the form of speech are a natural part of the children's discourse in the classroom.

The focus on the form of speech also accounts for the fact that the pupils' answers are a sequence of separate sentences. The same grammatical structures occur several times; pronouns, in particular, were not used although the pupils were familiar with them; there is no textual cohesion (Halliday 1973: 107).

At the end of the first transaction there is a change of focus; the formal aspect of speech is no longer as important as the function of language, in this case the transmission of information: The class regarded the answer "My daughter has a car" as a piece of information, the teacher took it as a formally correct answer. This explains the pupils' laughter--obviously the pupils were not yet able to express their feeling of the comic nature of the situation by verbal means. The teacher's question "Has she?", which they did not respond to, shows that the teacher, too, changed his role; he asked for a piece of information rather than for a correct sentence. The teacher's next move underlines this still further.

The conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is that the two functions of classroom discourse, informing and eliciting, are both focused in this transaction. They in turn aim at different pedagogical objectives: the transmission of information and the use of correct forms of the second language. And yet, both functions are combined in one transaction. The structure of the transaction can be described in the following way:

Boundary		
Direct	function:	requesting the pupils to pay attention and to look at the picture on the board
Inform	function:	information about some factors that determine a new context of the situation
Elicit	function:	designed to obtain verbal responses in connection with the information given and with regard to the formal means of expression
Elicit	function:	designed to obtain informative responses in connection

with the utterance made by a pupil

The second transaction gives further evidence of this; here the elicitation is naturally followed by a repeat/informing exchange because of the change of focus from the more or less communicative function to the mere forms of the language (She's got a headache). In other words, using the second language for communicative ends in the context of the classroom and learning the forms of the second language go together and have a share in the above example of classroom discourse.

2.2. So far we have dealt with classroom discourse in which the pupils' speech behaviour is tightly controlled by the teacher. If we want to analyse the speech behavious of children in speech events that are not dominated by the teacher, we have either to dispense with the teacher and leave the classroom or to concentrate on speech events where the children themselves can take the initiative and start a conversation in spite of the presence of the teacher. From a methodological viewpoint fictitious situations (cf. Nold 1976) enacted by pupils can be such occasions of free speech in the classroom, normally at the end of a teaching sequence.

Fictitious situations are ideally modelled on speech events taken from real life (mostly from outside the classroom). Therefore the model of discourse analysis developed by Sinclair and Coulthard cannot be applied without modifications. Other models of discourse analysis (e.g. Regan 1976) could replace it; however, it seems preferable to modify Sinclair and Coulthard's model in order to facilitate comparison between the first text and the following examples of free speech in the classroom. The functional components of speech that M. A. K. Halliday or D. H. Hymes have taken over from R. Jakobson are here incorporated into Sinclair and Coulthard's model. This means that some of the categories used by Sinclair and Coulthard have to be newly defined so as to suit the needs of the analysis of free speech in the classroom.

The following abbreviations in the texts are either new or have a different meaning from those of the original model:

Elicit: Elicitations do not occur isolated from the referential or directive function of speech; "Elicit" is used to indicate special referential or directive exchange types:
Ref:Elicit
Direct:Elicit a verbal response is expected

Ref:Inform
Directive no verbal response is expected

Moves of phatic speech: greet - greeting f - farewell sign - signifies an intention on the part of the speaker relative to the context

Emotive move: exp - expressive

T - teacher P - pupil PP - pupils

The next passage of classroom discourse is about a conversation between two eleven-year-old children who had been learning the second language for five months. It represents the part of the lesson that takes up the topic of TEXT 1.

(TEXT 2)

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act
Phatic	A: Ah Good morning, Mrs Jones.	exp greet	B: Good morning, Mrs Robinson.	greet
	How are you?	in-quiry	I'm fine.	rep
Ref:Elicit	A: Where is your daughter?	el	B: My daughter is at home.	rep
Ref:Elicit	A: What is she doing?	el	B: She's sleeping. She's ill.	rep
Ref:Elicit	A: What has she got?	el	B: She has - PAUSE - T: a cold She's a cold. B: She's a cold.	rep T-rep re
Ref:Inform	A: - PAUSE - T: My daughter A: My daughter PP: My daughter A: My daughter is My daughter is in the school.	T-p re P-p i		
Ref:Elicit	B: Can your daughter swim?	el	A: Yes, she can.	rep
Ref:Elicit	B: - PAUSE - How old is your daughter?	el	A: My daughter is seven.	rep
Ref:Inform	B: And my daughter is eight.	i	PP: NV (laughter)	rea
Direct: Elicit	A: Can you come this afternoon to visit us? to tea?	el	B: No, I can't.	rep
Ref:Elicit	- PAUSE - T: Why not? -PAUSE- A: Why not?	p el/re	B: I must wash my hair. (PP: NV (laughter))	rep (rea)
Boundary	T: All right FRAME Thank you.	m		

In order to detect the peculiarities of this text more clearly, a German version of classroom discourse is contrasted with the English one. The children playing the roles are the same age and members of the same class as those of the English text. The recording was made in a separate part of the lesson after the scene in English.

(TEXT 3)

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act
Phatic	A: Guten Morgen.	greet	B: Ach Guten Morgen, Frau Schneider.	exp greet
Ref:Elicit	B: Wie geht es denn Ihrer Tochter?	el	A: Der geht es sehr gut.	rep
Emotive	B: Aha	exp		
Ref:Elicit	B: Wie alt ist sie denn überhaupt?	el	A: Sie ist sieben Jahre alt.	rep
Emotive	B: Aha	exp		
Ref:Elicit	A: Wie alt wie alt ist Ihre?	el	B: Meine ist neun.	rep
Emotive: Elicit	A: Schon so alt?	el	B: Ja, natürlich. Geht ja auch in die dritte Klasse. (PP: NV (laughter))	rep com (rea)
Ref:Elicit /Phatic	A: Und wie geht es Ihnen?	el	B: Och mir geht's noch besser, als Sie denken. (PP: NV (laughter))	exp rep (rea)
Ref:Elicit	A: Wo gehn Sie denn jetzt hin?	el	B: Ich, ich wollte ein bißchen spazieren gehen, nur nach meiner Tochter gucken, die will wieder noch was herumstreichen ... streichen. (PP: NV (laughter))	rep reason (rea)
Phatic	A: Ich muß noch einkaufen gehen.	sign		
	B: Dann auf Wiedersehen.	f	A: Auf Wiedersehen.	f
Boundary	T: Danke schön. FRAME	m		

As we want to investigate how children make use of a second language and what the peculiarities of their speech are, a functional approach of discourse analysis cannot be dispensed with. The attempt to analyse discourse from a pragmalinguistic perspective can, however, become more meaningful and relevant if the pragmalinguistic aspect is not considered in isolation. In this paper the work of M. A. K. Halliday provides the larger theoretical framework, because in his model the language functions are integrated into a model of "communicative competence" (Halliday avoids this term in order to stress the distinct approach of his model (Halliday 1973:52); the model encompasses both the "meaning potential of the linguistic system" and the "context of culture", which are related to the "context of the situation" by means of the functions of language (cf. Halliday 1973: 99 ff, Nold 1976).

Accordingly, the task that the children were set can be described with reference to this theoretical framework: The children were supposed to play the roles of adults who knew each other and talked to one another in the fictitious setting of a street; their style of discourse was expected to be casual; the topic of their conversation centered around their children or similar topics of small talk among mothers. This is to say, the children were required to establish or to discontinue contact (phatic function) and to get or to supply certain pieces of information (referential function) (Hymes: referential and contextual). More generally the small talk between the mothers can be considered as phatic. The question arises in which way and to what extent the children achieved these aims both in the second language and in their mother tongue.

A comparison between the two texts shows that the children were aware of the conventional rules of phatic communion. In both languages they knew the most common formulas for greeting and polite inquiry. A rival version can be referred to in order to demonstrate how the children made the polite inquiry in German: "Wie geht es Ihnen? - Danke gut. Und Ihnen? - Auch bestens." The German version of polite inquiry belongs to a stylistic variety that is less formal than "How are you? - I'm fine, (thank you)".

The dialogue that follows shows important differences between the German and the English text. Both treat of the daughters and presuppose that speaker "A" knows speaker "B" has a daughter; in both cases the daughter is an interesting topic to talk about. However, whereas in the German text the conversation is carried on in a casual style of speech and in such a way that the questions and answers cannot only be regarded as exchanges of information but also as a continuation of the phatic exchange, in the English text there is a sudden change from the phatic part to the referential part. The question "Where is your daughter?" is a straight question for information that could naturally be asked by someone who has the right to be informed. It presupposes a different role relationship, preferably between socially unequal people, if it is to remain as straightforward as in the English text. This impression is due to the fact that the language used carried with it different social implications from those intended (reference to the context of culture) and that it represents a choice from the meaning potential of the language that is characterized by the prominence of the referential, "ideational" (Halliday 1973:100) function. The fact that the wh-questions and the simple statements belong to the common core of the grammatical system does not mean that they can be used indiscriminately in actual discourse. Informal speech,

small talk cannot be defined as some kind of basic speech.

A further observation can be made if the changes of interaction are analysed. As one might expect the major changes in the English and the German versions occur when the topic (daughter of A/B) is in turn taken up by the other participant (daughter of B/A). There is however an important difference. In German the expressive "Aha", which does not induce a response (no Elicit), allowed the other participant to take the initiative, in English it was the obvious inability of the first participant to carry on that brought about the first change of initiative; in fact, the conversation could have collapsed at this point as can be observed in many of the other samples of classroom discourse that were recorded. Since the children have not primarily to think of the content but rather of the correct form of their utterances, they are not as flexible in their second language speech behavior as in that of their native tongue. This also explains why the question "Can your daughter swim?" was put at a moment when it was utterly unexpected. There is no textual cohesion in the passage of discourse.

The second change of interaction in the English version occurs naturally and in an appropriate way. The invitation fits into the dialogue as a whole very well; in addition, it is interesting to observe that it follows an informing exchange, which does not demand an answer. The blunt refusal at the end of the English text, however, contrasts sharply with the appropriate farewell of the German text.

2.3. Before more general conclusion are drawn from the texts so far dealt with two more fictitious situations are analysed. The two texts are meant to show how children (age ten and eleven/about 100 English lessons) play the roles of adults, one of whom wishes to exert his or her influence on the other (directive function). The texts were prepared in class in a similar way as the TEXTS 2 and 3. The roles of husband and wife were played by a boy and a girl.

(TEXT 4)

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act
Direct: Elicit	A: Jack, where are my shoes?	el	B: Weiß i doch net. (PP: NV (laughter)) (T: an English husband! Jack, where are ...)	rep (rea) (T-d) (T-p)
Direct: Elicit	A: Jack, where are my shoes? I can't find my shoes.	el cl	B: I can't see your shoes. -PAUSE- Bad luck! (PP: NV (laughter))	rep exp (rea)
Directive	A: - PAUSE - T: Look in the bedroom. A: Look at the bedroom.	 T-p d/re	B: Ich steh da doch! Nix da also! (PP: NV (laughter)) B: I can't see your shoes in the bedroom.	rep (rea) rep

Directive	A: Now looking at in the kitchen.	d	B: I can't see your shoes in the kitchen. P: washing machine B: They are not in the washing machine. (PP: NV (laughter))	rep P-p rep (rea)
Directive	A: Look at the sitting-room.	d	B: Ach, I can see your shoes.	exp rep
Directive	A: Now bring me my shoes.	d	B: NV	rea

Texts 5 and 6 treat of the roles of a wealthy lady and her servant. The English and the German parts were taken by the same children in each version. The English version was acted out first.

(TEXT 5)

Exchange Type	Opening	Act	Answering	Act
Phatic	A: Morning	greet	B: Morning	greet
Directive	A: You must, er er, you must wash the windows (T:clean)and er,clean the house.	d	B: - GESTURE indicating uncertainty - (T: All right, now please do ...)	(T-d)
Directive	A: And you must shop bread and (T: go shopping)	d (T-cor)	B: - PAUSE - (T: Now please do these things and when you've finished, say 'I'm ready') B: NV	(T-d) rea
Ref:Inform	B: I'm ready.	i		
Directive	A: Now you must lay the table and (PP: wash my hair) clean my shoes and my husband's shoes. (prop: shoe) (PP: NV (laughter))	d (P-p) (rea)		
Ref:Inform	B: I'm ready.			

The German version:

(TEXT 6)

Phatic	A: Guten Morgen.	greet	B: Guten Morgen.	greet
Directive	A: Sie möchten bitte das Haus putzen, weil wir heute Besuch kriegen, und danach gehen Sie bitte einkaufen.	d rea-son	B: Noch was?	rep/el
Directive	A: Machen Sie bitte die Betten und putzen die Schuhe und decken den Tisch.	d	B: So so!	rep/exp

The first fictitious situation (TEXT 4) demonstrates very well the different behavioural strategies available to the boy who played the husband. At first, he did not take over the role in the second language and he was supported in this by other members of his class (laughter). Obviously he did not want to comply with his wife's (or the girl's?) request. This is why he did not give the answer that other children before him had given: "Mm, they aren't in the sitting room". Fortunately, after the teacher's interference his reply in English showed which linguistic means of the second language he had at his disposal to express the refusal: "I can't see your shoes - Bad luck." Apart from the difference in semantic meaning between his German and English replies, there is a difference of social varieties: Casual style and regional dialect in the German version, more formal style in English. The expressive "Bad luck" reveals that, in pragmalinguistic terms, the boy's intentions are the same as in German. A similar difference in social varieties can also be observed in his second reply. The boy's third answer points to another strategy. Instead of giving a German and an English reply he resorted to fun. His answer was grotesque and the class responded accordingly (laughter). His last answer is again a mixture of the two languages: Although he had learnt "Oh, dear" or "Well", which could have been used here, he spontaneously started his reply with the German expressive word "Ach".

The second fictitious situation (TEXTS 5 and 6) throws further light on the question of textual cohesion, which was found to be of importance. There is a marked similarity between "A"s opening moves in English and German, whereas there is a distinct discrepancy between "B"s answering moves.

Leaving aside the formal aspect of language as such, the question arises what factors shape the behaviour of participant "B". By means of a gesture participant "B" signals uncertainty. It seems she did not know whether she was supposed to say something or what she was to say or whether she should do something, namely to do her work as a servant. In this situation she was at a loss as she could not clear up the situation in the second language. Neither participant "B" nor participant "A" were able to tackle this problem by themselves without using their mother tongue. At this point the teacher stepped in and suggested a non-verbal reaction to the request. The child took the hint and acted accordingly.

The contrast between the English and the German versions, however, indicates that the child felt the need for some kind of verbal response. From a pragmalinguistic perspective the suggested non-verbal behaviour does not exclude but rather presuppose a verbal expression of willingness or contact. Moreover, the suggested behaviour can be regarded as a methodological technique of the "Direct Method" (i.e. giving and obeying orders in the artificial context of the classroom), precisely because there is no verbal response, which means that the fictitious communicative basis of the relationship between participant "A" and "B" was replaced by a methodological one.

We can conclude that participant "B" did not identify with his fictitious role and, strictly speaking, was not showing role-related behaviour. The gesture of uncertainty and the resulting "behaviour" and later the informing move "I'm ready" (certainly a methodological device) are critical moments in this uneven dialogue, which highlights the importanct of textual cohesion as

a factor of discourse analysis.

2.4. In our analysis of classroom discourse we have so far dealt with sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic characteristics of the speech of children. We have deliberately dispensed with the problem of error analysis in so far as it focuses on phonological, grammatical, and lexical mistakes. In recent years contrastive analysis has enormously increased our understanding of such mistakes. In our texts the prosodic features were found to be particularly liable to misconception. Furthermore, different types of interference can be observed. Intralingual interference: "My daughter can swimming" (TEXT 1), "Now looking at in the kitchen" (TEXT 4); a combination of intra- and interlingual interference: "And you must shop bread" (- go shopping - to shop - einkaufen gehen - Brot einkaufen) (TEXT 5).

However, in this paper focus is not on the children's mistakes so much as on the appropriateness of speech. The use of the auxiliary "must" (TEXT 5) can finally illustrate the discrepancy between the correctness and appropriateness of the linguistic forms in the children's speech that characterizes much of second language discourse in the classroom.

The pragmalinguistic function of the sentence "You must clean the house" can be referential or directive, depending on the context of its use. In TEXT 5 the role relationship between the two participants, the place and time - although fictitious - indicate that the sentence "You must..." is to be taken as a request or command. The context seems to be appropriate to the use of "must". However, if other options from the meaning potential of the linguistic system (Halliday 1975:124) are taken into account, it appears that the polite "Would you clean..." is more appropriate to the context unless the role-relationship, the degree of formality or informality, is changed, which would allow the following utterance to occur naturally without the impression of impoliteness: "Well, Pam, you know you must clean the house now." And yet, this distinction cannot ultimately be made without paying regard to prosodic features as well.

Thus the rhythm of the child's utterance (TEXT 5) is slow, falling nuclei mark the pattern of intonation: "You must ˈwash the ˌwindows and ˌclean the ˈhouse." This utterance would certainly be regarded as impolite if it was used in a real life situation similar to the fictitious one. The alternative form "Would you..." is to be preferred because it is generally considered to belong to polite speech (cf. Leech Svartvik 1975:143-7). Yet the children used "must" or the imperative whether the context demanded polite speech or not.

Again the corresponding German version (Sie mochten bitte..., weil wir...") demonstrates the child's awareness of different varieties of speech, in this case, of polite formal speech. Moreover, a special pattern of behaviour appears: The request is supplemented by a reason. This pattern is felt to be appropriate to polite speech in fairly unauthoritarian society. It underlines the importance of the cultural context in the analysis of discourse.

3.1. If the findings of our analysis are evaluated, several conclusions can be drawn from the observations made. To start with, the pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic analysis of the English and German samples of free speech in the classroom gives a clue to the behavioural strategies children use in order

to participate successfully in second language discourse. At least four strategies can be observed in the texts analysed.

3.1.1. Transfer of behavioural strategies from L 1 to L 2

First of all, the children made use of the patterns of behaviour that they had become familiar with in acquiring their mother tongue. Even in the early stages of second language learning they knew how to make statements and ask questions, they knew how to give orders, to make contact with one another, and to express their emotions. This does not imply that they always succeeded in transferring patterns of behaviour from L 1 to L 2.

What is more, they knew how to connect the different patterns of behaviour so as to play roles in speech events. In other words, children are able to use the parts of the linguistic system of L 2 they know in actual discourse. The fact that they have this ability can to a large extent be attributed to their communicative competence in L 1. TEXT 4 is a particularly revealing example in this respect. Participant "B" (TEXT 4) used the linguistic means available to him in a creative way, adapting them to his needs in order to express the same intentions as in his German version. The English equivalent can by no means be called a translation in the strict sense of the word because more literal translations would be possible and more appropriate. He achieved a similar effect by completely different linguistic means in L 2: "Weib i doch net" - "I can't see your shoes. Bad luck." What the two versions have in common is the indirect way of expressing a refusal.

Other examples of second language discourse suggest that transfer from the mother tongue need not be the most important influence on the speech behaviour of children. Thus the request participant "A" made in one of our samples of speech (TEXT 5) was certainly facilitated by the communicative competence in the mother tongue, but it was also shaped by the methodological step that introduced the fictitious situation. The two options from the meaning potential of the second language which certainly were at the disposal of the child, "must" and the imperative, occurred in the speech used in the methodological step.

3.1.2. Specific strategies developed in the context of the classroom

Fictitious situations in the classroom are necessarily linked with methodological steps in which the roles, the setting, and the topic of discourse are prepared and described. When children act out their roles, they can draw on the information given beforehand in a special methodological step. A comparison between TEXTS 1 and 2 shows that the children transferred certain lexical items and grammatical structures from the methodological step to the fictitious situation:

e.g. She's asleep	She's sleeping
She's ill in bed So she may be ill	She's ill
My daughter can swim	Can your daughter swim

What may she have
She's got a headache What has she got

The examples demonstrate that the methodological step facilitated, but did not determine the children's speech behaviour in the fictitious situation. The children were able to make use of the lexis and grammar in a more or less flexible way by adapting them to their context, although the resulting speech was not always appropriate.

Apart from this kind of transfer, it is interesting to observe that sometimes children pay different roles from those suggested. In one of our samples of speech (TEXT 2) the children's dialogue reminds us of a pattern of behaviour that is typical of the roles of teacher and pupil: question ("Where is...") - answer, question ("What is...") - answer, question ("What has...") - answer. Only later did the children succeed in acting out the roles of mothers.

Switches from one variety to another are a common feature of discourse; in the fictitious situation in the classroom the classroom register is one of these varieties.

A further strategy can be detected in the children's efficient use of grotesque utterances: e.g. "I must wash my hair" (TEXT 2) or "They are not in the washing machine" (TEXT 4). These utterances can only be understood in the context of the classroom because their effect depends on the presence of the class as audience.

3.1.3. Kinetic behaviour

Kinetic behaviour is another strategy to be considered in fictitious situations in the classroom. In one of the samples of speech (TEXT 5) a certain expression on the face of a participant and a movement of her arms indicate the uncertainty that the child felt in the fictitious situation. Further kinetic studies in second language teaching would reveal more about the learning process of children (cf. von Raffler-Engel 1975). Moreover, the pauses in almost all the samples of speech are also meaningful non-verbal signs in discourse. In second language learning they often signify a learner's difficulty in using the language.

3.1.4. Use of the mother tongue

The children whose speech we recorded were accustomed to a more or less monolingual method of second language learning. With the exception of their private conversations they generally tried to use the second language in their English lessons. This explains the great effect the use of the mother tongue had on the class when participant "B" (TEXT 4) replied in German. This violation of an accepted norm had similar effects to those described in multilingual communities in the case of intrusions (cg. Denison 1972:67). The child was certainly aware of the effect on the class; but he used German also because he could not express his intentions in the second language as easily and appropriately (from his viewpoint) as in German.

3.2. Approximative systems as intermediate stages in the learning process

3.2.1. Evaluating our findings with regard to the process of the acquisition of a second language, we may conclude that to some extent children develop a special kind of reduced code, which enables them to express their intentions more or less successfully despite the sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic deficiencies of their code (from the viewpoint of the native speaker). The speech behaviour of participant "B" (TEXT 4) is a typical example of this ("I can't see...").

Moreover, the sterotype use of one grammatical structure in TEXT 5 ("You must wash...") gives further evidence of the existence of a reduced code. And the use of the classroom register instead of more appropriate varieties of speech in the fictitious situations (TEXTS 2, 4, and 5) and the replacement of the fictitious communicative basis of speech by a methodological one (TEXT 5) are also to be interpreted as aspects of the children's reduced code.

The children's speech behaviour was not only conditioned by the simplified language (Prucha 1973:30) to be found in the teacher's own use (cf. TEXT 1) and in that of the teaching material, as one might expect, but also by the children's own choices from the meaning potential of the linguistic system that they had been exposed to in the classroom.

These findings show that the children used an approximative linguistic system (Nemser 1971), which indicates an intermediate stage in the learning process. Due to sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic deficiencies this approximative system can also be defined as a special kind of interlanguage (cf. Selinker 1971, Littlewood 1975, S. Pit Corder 1975). S. Pit Corder claims that the formal context of the classroom is likely to prevent the development of an interlanguage; his claim is substantiated by our findings in so far as the children were not allowed to develop a consistent grammar which deviates from the principle of grammatical correctness of speech. However, if the sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic aspects of language are taken into account, it becomes clear that at least partly the children were able to and were allowed to develop their own code. This code deviates from the norms of communicative appropriateness that characterizes the native speaker's use of the language.

3.2.2. The question is whether the teacher should accept the children's approximative systems and make use of them or whether he should try to suppress them.

Current trends in second language teaching, especially the insistence on the native speaker's type of communicative competence, certainly discourage the learner from developing his own approximative system, at least in theory.

Our analysis has underlined the enormous difficulties children (beginners) in the classroom have when using a second language and has pointed towards some of the strategies which can be applied in fictitious situations. If the older children's (age 12) samples of speech in our corpus, which this paper can only refer to briefly, are also taken into account, it becomes apparent that a second language teacher cannot judge the importance of the sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic deficiencies of the children's speech in isolation, but has to evaluate them in relation to basic grammatical, lexical, and phonological mistakes. The following telephone conversation

(parts taken by two twelve-year-old children) shows that the children make basic grammatical mistakes (cf. also Steltmann 1977) and are yet able to communicate with one another although a native speaker would have difficulties in understanding the meaning of their utterances:

A: Oh, hello Steven, what have you done yesterday?
B: I lost my way in London.
A: Oh, where?
B: Oh, I asked a man who's who's Fleet Street. But the man didn't understand me. He is a German.
A. That was very terrible, yes.

As the children have already acquired their mother tongue, it is obviously easier for them to communicate with one another, however inappropriate their speech may be from the viewpoint of the native speaker, than to use appropriate and correct forms even if they are common-core features (Crystal Davy 1969:65) of the second language.

The question arises whether the second language teacher is not confronted with a dilemma here. If he focuses the learner's attention on the common core of the language, he has to neglect the stylistically marked features and the learner's speech behaviour is then likely to be inappropriate. If, on the other hand, he presents to the learners (pragmalinguistically and sociolinguistically) appropriate texts, many learners will be unable to achieve proficiency in the use of the common core of the language.

3.2.3. Methodological suggestions

We can find a way out of this dilemma if we allow the second language learners to develop their own sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic types of approximative system as intermediate stages in the learning process. Even if we do not force them to conform to the native speaker's speech behaviour, our ultimate objective can still be an approximation of the native speaker's type of communicative competence. In order to achieve this gradually without asking too much of the learners, the receptive and the productive skills could be trained in different ways. The fact that different skills are needed for the process of encoding and decoding should be exploited far more extensively as far as the choices from the meaning potential of the language are concerned.

After the initial stages of second language learning the teaching material for listening and reading comprehension would have to be based on more or less authentic texts, which would enable the learners to become familiar with the native speaker's language, whereas the teaching material for speaking and writing would have to be based on an artificial code (in pragmalinguistic and sociolinguitic terms), which would allow the learners to direct their attention to the common-core features of the language.

This arrangement would give the learners the opportunity to develop their own speech behaviour and to adapt it gradually to the native speaker's

model without neglecting the basic patterns of grammar, lexis, and phonology. Furthermore, it would help the learners to remain interested in learning the language even after the initial stages, because their own interests could be taken care of, to a greater extent than nowadays, in the texts for listening and reading comprehension. Second language learning could become at once both more efficient and satisfying.

References

I should like to acknowledge the assistance of Peter Dines (England) for his many critical suggestions and for reading through the text.

S. Pit Corder: "Present Trends of Applied Linguistics". Paper presented at the Fourth AILA World Congress. Stuttgart:1975

D. Crystal, D. Davy: Investigating English Style. London:1969

N. Denison: "Some Observations on Language Variety and Plurilingualism". In: J. B. Pride, J. Holmes (ed.): Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: 1972, 65-77

M. A. K. Halliday: Explorations in the Functions of Language. London:1973

M. A. K. Halliday: Learning how to mean - Explorations in the Development of Language. London:1975

S. H. Houston: "Child Black English: The School Register". In: Linguistics 90, 1972, 20-34

D. H. Hymes: "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life". In: J. J. Gumperz, D. Hymes (ed.): Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Ethnography of Communication. New York:1972, 35-71

R. Jakobson: "Functions of Language". In: J. P. B. Allen, S. Pit Corder (ed.):Readings for Applied Linguistics. London:1973, 51-57

G. Leech, J. Svartvik: A Communicative Grammar of English. London:1975

W. T. Littlewood: "The Acquisition of Communicative Competence in an Artificial Environment". In: PRAXIS des neusprachlichen Unterricht 1/75, 13-21

W. Nemser: "Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners". In: International Review of Applied Linguistics: 1971, 115-123

G. Nold: "The Notion of Situation: Its Meaning and Function in Linguistic and Second Language Teaching". In: G. Nickel (ed.): Pragmalinguistik. Sonderband zum Vierten Weltkongress. Stuttgart:1976 (forthcoming)

J. Prucha: "Verbal Communication in the Classroom - A Case for Applied Linguistics". In: Linguistics:112, 1973, 23-37

W. von Raffler-Engel: "Language Acquisition and Common Sense". In: E. F. K. Koerner: The Transformational-Generative Paradigm and Modern Linguistic Theory. Amsterdam: 1975, 321-328

J. Regan: Childspeak Corpus. Claremont Graduate School:1976

J. Rehbein, K. Ehlich: Kommunikation in der Schule. Arbeitspapier I. Begrunden. Manuscript:1975 (paper presented at Fourth AILA World Congress. Stuttgart:1975)

G. Sankoff: "Language Use in Multilingual Societies: Some Alternative

Approaches". In: J. B. Pride, J. Holmes (ed.): Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth: 1972, 35-51

L. Selinker: "Interlanguage". In: International Review of Applied Linguistics:1971, 115-123

K. Steltmann: "Englische Grammatik-Kenntnisse in der gymnasialen Oberstufe". In: PRAXIS der neusprachlichen Unterrichts:2/77, 140-7

J. McH Sinclair, R. M. Coulthard: Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The English used by teachers and pupils. London:1975